

continuing to be overcapacity during peak use periods. No major facilities would be built, and no major park functions would be relocated. Any required facility changes would be done in or adjacent to existing disturbed areas. The number of overnight accommodations, campsites, and all other visitor services would remain the same in each developed area. Minor adjustments in management would be made to help reduce resource damage and to provide a safer visitor experience.

Under the "Minimum Requirements" alternative (Alternative 1), planning would be focused within the park (similar to the No-Action alternative). Issues related to planning and land management in areas adjacent to the park would be individually handled as the need arose, without overall area vision or an integrated regional planning effort to give direction. Unlimited day visitation would continue in all park developed areas until visitor congestion, resource damage, and public safety warranted restricting peak visitation access. This would be accomplished by implementing reservation systems based on capacity of existing parking and eating facilities on the South and North Rims. Regional information programs would explain the park's reservation systems to visitors. Overnight accommodations would not be affected. Visitor use at Tuweep and on corridor trails would not be limited under this alternative. Existing land use patterns would be retained—no major facilities would be built, no major park functions would be relocated, and most park facilities would remain where they are now (some minor facilities would be added). Any required facility changes would be accomplished in or adjacent to existing disturbed areas.

Under the "Reduced Park Development" alternative (Alternative 3), planning for the park would be done in a regional context to minimize negative impacts resulting from park uses being placed in areas outside the park. Communications would be expanded (as with Alternative 2). Wherever possible, facilities placed outside the park would be clustered in disturbed areas and linked to existing systems. Preserving the park's natural and cultural resources would be emphasized; many disturbed areas would be rehabilitated. Alternate modes of transportation would be emphasized regionally as well as in major park high use areas (as with Alternative 2). Park resources would be preserved by placing all new facilities and relocating many existing functions outside the

park. Cooperative regional planning would ensure that NPS functions occurring outside park boundaries featured sustainable planning and design. The NPS would expand its regional information services (as with Alternative 2). On the South Rim all day visitor vehicles would be removed, and a major public transit system would be provided. No new lands within the park would be disturbed, and historic uses of existing structures would be retained wherever possible. Overnight accommodations would be reduced on the South Rim but increased on the North Rim by adaptively reusing historic structures.

Under the "Increased Park Development" alternative (Alternative 4), planning outside the park would emphasize regional information (as with Alternative 2). Cooperative planning with outside entities would focus on disseminating information, providing trip planning assistance, and distributing visitor use. Actions to improve visitor convenience would place major visitor services inside the park wherever reasonable, and visitors would be distributed throughout the park's developed areas. No day use limits would be established unless the visitor experience was significantly degraded. The type of vehicular use allowed in some areas would be restricted, and high use areas would be accessible only by transit vehicles or hiking or biking (as with Alternative 2). Other developed areas would be accessible by private vehicles. Overnight accommodations would be increased in all developed areas on the North and South Rims by adaptively reusing existing structures and constructing some new facilities (either in or adjacent to disturbed areas).

SUMMARY: Based upon the analysis in the DEIS, and taking into account all comments obtained from public meetings and received in writing from reviewers, Alternative 2 (as described in the DEIS and modified somewhat in the subject FEIS) is identified as the general management plan proposed to be adopted to guide future management of Grand Canyon National Park. The no action period on this FEIS will expire 30 days after Notice of its availability is published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the **Federal Register**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A limited number of copies of the FEIS/GMP are available upon request from: Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023 (520)638-7945; or the Planning Team Leader, Grand Canyon General

Management Plan, National Park Service, TWE-Denver Service Center, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287 (303)969-2267.

As noted in the **Federal Register** Notice published March 13, 1995, the official responsible for a decision on the action proposed is the Regional Director, Western Regional Office, National Park Service. Subsequently, the officials responsible for implementing the approved plan are the Field Director, Intermountain Field Office, National Park Service and the Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park.

Dated: July 12, 1995.

Stanley T. Albright,

Regional Director, Western Region.

[FR Doc. 95-18410 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Richmond National Battlefield Park Draft General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement/Land Resource Protection Study

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality Regulations and National Park Service Policy, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the release of the Draft General Management Plan (Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS) for Richmond National Battlefield Park, Virginia.

DATES: The Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS will be on public review until September 30, 1995. All review comments must be postmarked no later than October 2, 1995. Open house public meetings will be held.

6:00-10:00 pm Wednesday, August 9, 1995—Laurel Hill United Methodist Church, Fellowship Hall, 1991 New Market Rd., Richmond, VA 23231

5:00-9:00 pm Thursday, August 10, 1995—Beulah Presbyterian Church, 7252 Beulah Church Rd., Mechanicsville, VA 23111

12:30-4:30 pm Friday, August 11, 1995—Chesterfield County Historical Society, "Old Courthouse" at the Administration Complex, 10011 Iron Bridge Rd., Chesterfield, VA 23832

9:00 am-1:00 pm Saturday, August 12, 1995—St. John's Church Parish Hall, 2401 E. Broad St., Richmond, VA 23223

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS presents four alternatives for future management and use of Richmond National Battlefield Park.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Richmond National Battlefield Park, 3215 Broad Street, Richmond, Virginia 23223, (804) 226-1981.

For copies of the Draft GMP/EIS/LRPS, please contact the Superintendent at the above address.

Dated: July 17, 1995.

Marie Rust,

Field Director, Northeast Field Area.

[FR Doc. 95-18501 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

Bureau of Reclamation

Bay-Delta Advisory Council Meeting

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Bay-Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) will meet to discuss several issues including: review of the plan of action; discussion of problem definition, goals and objectives, and a mission statement; and discussion of other program components. The meeting is open to the public. Interested persons may make oral statements to the BDAC or may file written statements for consideration.

DATES: The Bay-Delta Advisory Council will meet from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm on Wednesday, August 16, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The Bay-Delta Advisory Council will meet at the Capital Plaza Holiday Inn, 300 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Sharon Gross, CALFED Bay-Delta Program, at (916) 657-2666.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary is a critically important part of California's natural environment and economy. In recognition of the serious problems facing the region and the complex resource management decisions that must be made, the state of California and the Federal government are working together to stabilize, protect, restore, and enhance the Bay-Delta Estuary. The State and Federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Bay-Delta Estuary are working together as CALFED to provide policy direction and oversight for the process.

One area of Bay-Delta management includes the establishment of a joint State-Federal process to develop long-term solutions to problems in the Bay-Delta Estuary related to fish and wildlife, water supply reliability, natural disasters, and water quality. The

intent is to develop a comprehensive and balanced plan which addresses all of the resource problems. This effort will be carried out under the policy direction of CALFED. A group of citizen advisors representing California's agricultural, environmental, urban, business, fishing, and other interests who have a stake in finding long term solutions for the problems affecting the Bay-Delta Estuary has been chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) as the Bay-Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) to advise CALFED on the program mission, problems to be addressed, and objectives for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. BDAC will also provide a forum to help ensure public participation, and will review reports and other materials prepared by CALFED staff.

Minutes of the meeting will be maintained by the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Suite 1155, 1416 Ninth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, and will be available for public inspection during regular business hours, Monday through Friday within 30 days following the meeting.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

Roger Patterson,

Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 95-18500 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-M

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Docket No. AB-3 (Sub-No. 122X)]

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company—Abandonment Exemption—in Saline County, KS (Trigo Industrial Lead)

AGENCY: Interstate Commerce Commission.

ACTION: Notice of exemption.

SUMMARY: The Commission, under 49 U.S.C. 10505, exempts from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 10903-04 the abandonment by Missouri Pacific Railroad Company of a 0.40-mile portion of the Trigo Industrial Lead extending from the end of the line at milepost 491.2 to milepost 491.6 near Salina, in Saline County, KS, subject to standard labor protective conditions.

DATES: Provided no formal expression of intent to file an offer of financial assistance has been received, this exemption will be effective on August 26, 1995. Formal expressions of intent to file an offer¹ of financial assistance under 49 CFR 1152.27(c)(2) must be

¹ See Exempt. of Rail Abandonment—Offers of Finan. Assist., 4 I.C.C.2d 164 (1987).

filed by August 7, 1995; petitions to stay must be filed by August 11, 1995; requests for a public use condition must be filed by August 16, 1995; and petitions to reopen must be filed by August 21, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send pleadings referring to Docket No. AB-3 (Sub-No. 122X) to: (1) Office of the Secretary, Case Control Branch, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20423; and (2) Joseph A. Anthofer, 1416 Dodge Street, Room 830, Omaha, NE 68179-0830.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph H. Dettmar, (202) 927-5660. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 927-5721.]

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Additional information is contained in the Commission's decision. To purchase a copy of the full decision, write to, call, or pick up in person from: Dynamic Concepts, Inc., Interstate Commerce Commission Building, 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room 2229, Washington, DC 20423. Telephone: (202) 289-4357/4359. [Assistance for the hearing impaired is available through TDD services (202) 927-5271.]

Decided: July 12, 1995.

By the Commission, Chairman Morgan, Vice Chairman Owen, and Commissioners Simmons and McDonald.

Vernon A. Williams,

Secretary

[FR Doc. 95-18460 Filed 7-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7035-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7 and 42 U.S.C. 9622(d)(2), notice is hereby given that a proposed consent decree in *United States v. Terry Shaner, et al.*, Civil Action No. 85-1372, was lodged on July 10, 1995, with the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. A motion to file an amended complaint was filed simultaneously with the lodging of the Consent Decree.

The proposed consent decree requires the current Site owners/operators (Terry Shaner, Sr., Susan Shaner, and Terry Shaner, Jr.): (1) To enter into a Consent Judgment for payment of \$50,000 with interest (over time) based on EPA's assessment of their inability to pay their fair share of response costs; (2) to convey a conservation easement to